

**To:** CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]  
**Cc:** []  
**Bcc:** []  
**From:** CN=Tom Hagler/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US  
**Sent:** Fri 6/5/2009 6:34:52 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: Comments on Periodic Review Staff Report- Request for Time Extension  
[tstokely@att.net](mailto:tstokely@att.net)  
<http://www.c-win.org/>

Yes, I agree. By the hearing, everyone will have digested the NMFS opinion and be in court, so I don't see much point in waiting. And it's not our call anyway.

They may feel differently just because this next week will be very busy IF they were wanting to put substantive stuff in their comments AND everyone is filing TRO notices and oppositions. So I'm sympathetic to the resource issues but don't really want to slow down the board.

-----Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US wrote: -----

**To:** Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
**From:** Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US  
**Date:** 06/05/2009 11:03AM  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: Comments on Periodic Review Staff Report- Request for Time Extension

I need to return his call as he's asking what we plan. I will tell him that we want Board to go "full speed ahead", while taking advantage of the BOs and their supporting science. I see no pt in another month to approve staff report or to taking staff time to add the NMFS stuff in more specifically.

~~~~~  
KAREN SCHWINN  
Associate Director  
Water Division  
U.S. EPA Region 9  
75 Hawthorne Street (Wtr-1)  
San Francisco, CA 94105  
415/972-3472  
415/947-3537 (fax)  
~~~~~

Tom Hagler---06/05/2009 10:49:52 AM---Probably feeling like reading an 800 page BO is enough work for one week. That's certainly what I t

**From:** Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US  
**To:** Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
**Date:** 06/05/2009 10:49 AM  
**Subject:** Re: Fw: Comments on Periodic Review Staff Report- Request for Time Extension

Probably feeling like reading an 800 page BO is enough work for one week. That's certainly what I think. (Even though the substance is only about 150 pages).

-----Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US wrote: -----

To: Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US@EPA  
From: Karen Schwinn/R9/USEPA/US  
Date: 06/05/2009 09:58AM  
Subject: Fw: Comments on Periodic Review Staff Report- Request for Time Extension

Why would they want to slow the Board down?  
Sent by EPA Wireless E-Mail Services

From: "Tom Stokely" [tstokely@att.net]  
Sent: 06/05/2009 09:48 AM MST  
To: <commentletters@waterboards.ca.gov>; <cyip@waterboards.ca.gov>; <emahaney@waterboards.ca.gov>  
Cc: <Yoshi.Laura@epamail.epa.gov>; Alexis Strauss; "Bill Jennings" <DeltaKeep@aol.com>; "Michael Jackson" <mjatty@sbcglobal.net>; <Jackson.Lisa@epa.mail.epa.gov>; Karen Schwinn; LisaP Jackson; <garwin.yip@noaa.gov>; <McInnis.Rod@noaa.gov>; "Tim Strohane" <stroshan@spillwaynews.net>  
Subject: Comments on Periodic Review Staff Report- Request for Time Extension

Please consider the attached request by the California Water Impact Network and the California Sportfishing Protection Alliance for a 30 day time extension for comments on the Draft Staff Report for the Periodic Review of the Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan. The time extension is being requested because of the need for time to review yesterday's Biological Opinion on the CVP/SWP OCAP by the National Marine Fisheries Service in relation to the WQCP.

Sincerely,

Tom Stokely  
Water Policy Coordinator  
California Water Impact Network  
504A Lennon St. (USPS and UPS)  
Mt Shasta, CA 96067  
V/FAX 530-926-9727  
Cell 530-524-0315  
tstokely@att.net  
<http://www.c-win.org/>

[attachment "C-WIN- CSPA request for 30 day time extension on BD WQCP work plan June 2009.doc" removed by Tom Hagler/R9/USEPA/US]